

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES  
FRIDAY, APRIL 6, 2001  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

- S095883      J. Dale Debber et al., Cross-complainants and Appellants  
                 v.  
                 Barbara Hunyada, Cross-defendant and Respondent  
                 Pursuant to written request of petitioner the above-entitled  
                 petition for review is ordered withdrawn.
- S095960      In re Gilbert Jones Jr.  
                 on  
                 Habeas Corpus  
                 Pursuant to written request of petitioner the above-entitled  
                 petition for review is ordered withdrawn.
- 5th Dist.  
F034962      People, Respondent  
                 v.  
                 Porfirio Alvarado Rojo, Appellant  
                 The time for granting review on the court's own motion is hereby  
                 extended to and including May 18, 2001. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule  
                 28(a)(1).)
- 3rd Dist.  
C037345      Mercy General Hospital, Petitioner  
                 v.  
S095178      Workers' Compensation Appeals Board, et al., Respondents  
                 The time for granting or denying review in the above-entitled  
                 matter is hereby extended to and including May 14, 2001, or the date  
                 upon which review is either granted or denied.
- 4th Dist.  
G023666      People, Plaintiff and Respondent  
                 v.  
Div. 3      Cuahutemoc Sanchez Valencia, Defendant and Appellant  
                 The time for granting or denying review in the above-entitled  
                 matter is hereby extended to and including May 21, 2001, or the date  
                 upon which review is either granted or denied.

S007531 People, Respondent

v.

Kevin Bernard Haley, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's reply brief is extended to and including June 4, 2001.

S024416 People, Respondent

v.

Dellano Leroy Cleveland and Chauncey Jamal Veasley, Appellants

On application of appellant Chauncey Jamal Veasley and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to and including May 29, 2001.

S027264 People, Respondent

v.

Jack Wayne Friend, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to and including June 4, 2001.

S032509 People, Respondent

v.

Erik Sanford Chatman, Appellant

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file respondent's brief is extended to and including May 31, 2001.

S040575 People, Respondent

v.

Delany Geral Marks, Appellant

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file respondent's brief is extended to and including June 4, 2001.

S047056 People, Respondent

v.

Ignacio Arriola Tafoya, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to and including May 2, 2001.

S056391 People, Respondent

v.

Bob Russell Williams, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the appellant is granted to and including June 28, 2001, to request correction of the record on appeal. Counsel for appellant is ordered to notify the Clerk of the Supreme Court in writing as soon as the act as to which the Court has granted an extension of time has been completed.

S071265 In re Kurt Michaels

on

Habeas Corpus

On application of petitioner and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file petitioner's reply to informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus is extended to and including April 26, 2001.

S084292 In re David Keith Rogers

on

Habeas Corpus

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file respondent's informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus is extended to and including April 23, 2001.

S094039 People, Respondent

v.

Robert Gene Sinohui, Appellant

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file respondent's opening brief on the merits is extended to and including April 30, 2001.

No further extensions of time are contemplated.

S096507 Victor Legans, Petitioner

v.

Los Angeles County Superior Court, Respondent

People, Real Party in Interest

The above-entitled matter is transferred to the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, for consideration in light of *Hagan v.*

*Superior Court* (1962) 57 Cal.2d 767. In the event the Court of Appeal determines that this petition is substantially identical to a prior petition, the repetitious petition shall be denied.

Bar  
Misc.  
4186

In the Matter of the Application of the Committee of Bar Examiners of the State of California for Admission of Attorneys

The written motion of the Committee of Bar Examiners that the following named applicants, who have fulfilled the requirements for admission to practice law in the State of California, be admitted to the practice of law in this state is hereby granted, with permission to the applicants to take the oath before a competent officer at another time and place:

(LIST OF NAMES ATTACHED TO ORIGINAL ORDER)

S094859

In re **Richard Frank Pinal** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Richard Frank Pinal, State Bar No. 152727**, be suspended from the practice of law for six months, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for two years subject to the conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its Order Approving Stipulation filed on October 26, 2000, as modified by its order filed November 29, 2000. It is further ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar and one-half of said costs shall be added to and become part of the membership fees for the years 2002 and 2003. (Bus. & Prof. Code section 6086.10.)

S094861

In re **Jose Luis Ramos** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Jose Luis Ramos, State Bar No. 91501**, be suspended from the practice of law for five years, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for five years on condition that he be actually suspended for 42 months and until he has shown proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct and until he makes restitution to Jaime Calderon (or the Client Security Fund, if appropriate) in the

Amount of \$29,000.00 plus 10% interest per annum from July 26, 1995, and furnishes satisfactory proof thereof to the Probation Unit, State Bar Office of the Chief Trial Counsel. He is further ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its Order Approving Stipulation filed on November 29, 2000, as modified by its order filed January 8, 2001. It is also ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination during the period of his actual suspension. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) **Jose Luis Ramos** is further ordered to comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the effective date of this order.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar and one-quarter of said costs shall be added to and become part of the membership fees for the years 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005. (Bus. & Prof. Code section 6086.10.)

\*(See Bus. and Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S094863 In re **Robert Alan Fiddes** on Discipline

It is hereby ordered that **Robert Alan Fiddes, State Bar No. 129261**, be disbarred from the practice of law and that his name be stricken from the roll of attorneys. He is also ordered to comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and to perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the date this order is effective.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar.

\*(See Bus. and Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S094951 In re **Charles David Weede, Jr** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Charles David Weede, Jr., State Bar No. 51778**, be suspended from the practice of law for one year, that execution of suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for two years on condition that he be actually suspended for 45 days. Respondent is also ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation executed on November 3, 2000, as modified by its order filed December 4, 2000. It is further ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891,

fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar pursuant to Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in equal installments for membership years 2002 and 2003.

S094952 In re **Peter George Virag** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Peter George Virag, State Bar No. 135542**, be suspended from the practice of law for 30 days, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for three years subject to the conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its Order Approving Stipulation executed October 17, 2000, as modified by its order filed November 29, 2000. It is further ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar and one-half of said costs shall be added to and become part of the membership fees for the years 2002 and 2003. (Business & Professions Code section 6086.10.)

S095009 In re **H. Lee Watson** on Discipline

It is ordered that **H. Lee Watson, State Bar No. 67953**, be suspended from the practice of law for three years, that execution of suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for four years subject to the conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its Order Approving Stipulation filed October 12, 2000, as modified by its order filed November 29, 2000. It is further ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar and one-third of said costs shall be added to and become part of the membership fees for the years 2002, 2003 and 2004. (Business & Professions Code section 6086.10.)

S095011 In re **Connie Sue Kramer** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Connie Sue Kramer, State Bar No. 100973**, be suspended from the practice of law for one year, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that she be placed on probation for two years subject to the conditions of probation, including nine months actual suspension, recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation executed

December 13, 2000. It is further ordered that she comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and that she perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 calendar days, respectively, after the effective date of this order.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6140.7.

\*(See Bus. and Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S095064 In re **Derk W. Schutmaat** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Derk W. Schutmaat, State Bar No. 163633**, be suspended from the practice of law for one year, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for three years subject to the conditions of probation, including 90 days actual suspension, recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed on November 22, 2000. It is also ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) It is further ordered that he comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and that he perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 calendar days, respectively, after the effective date of this order.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar pursuant to Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in equal installments for membership years 2002 and 2003.

\*(See Bus. and Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S095066 In re **Debbie Detrixhe** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Debbie Detrixhe, State Bar No. 102659**, be suspended from the practice of law for four years, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that she be actually suspended from the practice of law for two years as recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its decision filed on September 18, 2000, as modified by its order filed November 22, 2000; and until the State Bar Court grants a motion to terminate her actual suspension pursuant to rule 205 of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California; and until she provides proof to the satisfaction of the State Bar Court of her rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii) of the standards for Attorney Sanctions for

Professional Misconduct. Respondent is also ordered to comply with the conditions of probation, if any, hereinafter imposed by the State Bar Court as a condition for termination of her actual suspension. It is further ordered that respondent take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination during the period of her actual suspension. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) It is further ordered that respondent comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and that she perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the effective date of this order.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6140.7.

\*(See Bus. and Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S096362

In the Matter of the Resignation of **Nicola Suzanne Blair**  
A Member of the State Bar of California

The voluntary resignation of **Nicola Suzanne Blair, State Bar No. 165232**, as a member of the State Bar of California is accepted without prejudice to further proceedings in any disciplinary proceeding pending against respondent should she hereafter seek reinstatement. It is ordered that she comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court and that she perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 60 and 70 days, respectively, after the date this order is filed.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar.

\*(See Bus. and Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S096363

In the Matter of the Resignation of **James Edward Hennessy**  
A Member of the State Bar of California

The voluntary resignation of **James Edward Hennessy, State Bar No. 46341**, as a member of the State Bar of California is accepted without prejudice to further proceedings in any disciplinary proceeding pending against respondent should he hereafter seek reinstatement. It is ordered that he comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court and that he perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 60 and 70 days, respectively, after the date this order is filed.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar.

\*(See Bus. and Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)



S096390

In the Matter of the Resignation of **Theodore Lewis Slinkard**

A Member of the State Bar of California

The voluntary resignation of **Theodore Lewis Slinkard**, **State Bar No. 31453**, as a member of the State Bar of California is accepted without prejudice to further proceedings in any disciplinary proceeding pending against respondent should he hereafter seek reinstatement. It is ordered that he comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court and that he perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 60 and 70 days, respectively, after the date this order is filed.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar.

\*(See Bus. and Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

